



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/626,967 | 07/27/2000 | Ayahito Kojima | 1081.1093/JDH | 1013 |

21171 7590 01/24/2005

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

ALPHONSE, FRITZ

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2133

DATE MAILED: 01/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Response to Rule 312 Communication | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/626,967 | KOJIMA ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Fritz Alphonse | 2133 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

1. ☒ The amendment filed on 15 October 2004 under 37 CFR 1.312 has been considered, and has been:

a) ☐ entered.

b) ☐ entered as directed to matters of form not affecting the scope of the invention.

c) ☐ disapproved because the amendment was filed after the payment of the issue fee.

Any amendment filed after the date the issue fee is paid must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.313(c)(1) and the required fee to withdraw the application from issue.

d) ☐ disapproved. See explanation below.

e) ☒ entered in part. See explanation below.

See Continuation Sheet

Continuation of 1 (e) Entered in part. See explanation: 1. The amendment to independent claims 1 and 7 has been entered.


2. However, the amendment to claims 5 and 6 has not been entered.

Independent claim 5 was amended (see line 3) to recite the limitation "wherein input video data of each pixel is converted into output data". Dependent claim 6, however, recites the limitation "a first gray scale area for the video input data" in line 3. That limitation would be improper for lacking of antecedent basis. A new question of patentability would affect the claims. In order to avoid the 112 rejection, the consideration under 35 U.S.C. 312 to claims 5 and 6 has not be entered.



Fritz Alphonse

Art Unit 2133



ALBERT DECADY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

encl.